

REMARKS

In this response to the above-identified Office Action, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended. No claims have been added or cancelled. Accordingly, Claims 1-4 and 8-16 are pending in the application.

Interview Summary

Applicant greatly appreciates Examiner's time in discussion via telephone conference on January 15, 2009. Examiner and Attorney for the Applicant discussed the 101 rejections of the Office Action. Examiner suggested that Applicant amend the claims to tie the respective methods to hardware. Applicant proposed the amendments submitted herein and directed Examiner to support in the specification as described below. Examiner suggested that Applicant submit the proposed amendments in the present response.

Claim Amendments

Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 8 to clarify that the claimed methods are "to be performed by a computer." Support for the amendments may be found in the specification at least at ¶¶ 0017 and 0100. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added, and that the amendments are within the scope of Examiner's search.

Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-4 and 8-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully disagrees for the following reasons.

Applicant has amended Claim 1 to include "a digital signature method to be performed by a computer based on braid group conjugacy problem" (emphasis added). Applicant respectfully submits that, and as Examiner has suggested, the method as recited in the amended claim is in fact tied to a technological art, environment, and machine, resulting in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result. Contrary to the assertion in the Office Action at p. 3, the claimed method as amended does require integrating a machine (e.g., a computer). Thus, Claim 1 is directed to statutory subject matter

under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the subject matter rejection of this claim are requested.

Independent Claim 8, as amended, includes elements similar to those of Claim 1. For at least the reasons discussed above in relation to Claim 1, Applicants submit that Claim 8 is also directed to statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the subject matter rejection of this claim are requested.

Claims 2-4 and 9-16 depend from Claims 1 and 8, respectively, and include the limitations thereof. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to the independent claims, Applicants submit that the dependent claims are also directed to statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the subject matter rejection of these claims are requested.

Applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application; the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees due or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2421.

Sincerely,

Dated: January 16, 2009

 /David R. Stevens/
David R. Stevens
Reg. No. 38,626

Stevens Law Group
1754 Technology Drive, Suite 226
San Jose, CA 95110
Phone (408) 288-7588
Fax (408) 288-7542